

REMARKS

Claims 6, 7, 11, 12 and 14-27 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action the drawings for Figures 1-7 were objected to “because hash markings and lettering/numbering are not clear and legible.”

Claims 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 21-24 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 4,884,604 to Rice et al. (hereinafter “*Rice*”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,452,751 to Engler, III et al. (hereinafter “*Engler*”). Claims 18 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 4,884,604 to Rice et al. (hereinafter “*Rice*”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,452,751 to Engler, III et al. (hereinafter “*Engler*”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,367,933 to Jaksha (hereinafter “*Jaksha*”). Claims 20 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of U.S. Patent No. 4,884,604 to Rice et al. (hereinafter “*Rice*”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,452,751 to Engler, III et al. (hereinafter “*Engler*”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,868,188 to Fukuda (hereinafter “*Fukuda*”). Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

Regarding the objection to Figures 1-7, original Figures 1-7 have been replaced by the new Figures 1-7 as of the present amendment (*see* attached sheets of drawings) in order to more clearly indicate the shading, lettering and numbering in the Figures. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of independent claims 6 and 11, Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 6 and 11 currently require “at least two groups [of hole patterns] having different radial hole center distances, for mounting routers having different mounting footprints.” None of the art of record, including *Rice* and *Engler*, alone or in combination, teaches, suggests or contemplates the ability or desirability of being able to mount various routers having different mounting footprints as required by claims 6 and 11.

Rice is directed to a routing table with the ability to move the workpiece support surface about both a horizontal and vertical axis, so as to accommodate any desired angle of contact between the workpiece and the cutting tool. Nowhere does *Rice* teach, suggest or contemplate the ability of the table to accommodate mounting various routers having different mounting footprints as required by claims 6 and 11. In fact, *Rice* teaches away from the present claims as *Rice* does not even contemplate the use of multiple routers. *Rice* is clearly not concerned with or

directed to various routers having different footprints as evidenced by the following quote from *Rice*:

“A router designated generally by the numeral 30 is mounted on the back side (relative to the platform 12) of plate 24 and has its working bit 32 projecting through an opening in the plate to the opposite side.” (Col. 2, lines 36-39)

This is the only reference in *Rice* referring to the mounting of a router to the mounting plate. In fact, nowhere does *Rice* even discuss how to mount such a router to *Rice*'s “Guide Fence and Mitre Gauge Assembly For Router Mounting Table.”

Regarding *Engler*, *Engler* strictly teaches away from the present invention as claimed. The alleged plurality of different hole patterns (20, 22) having differing radial hole center distances referred to in the Office Action at page 3 are not for mounting routers having different footprints as described in the Office Action. In fact, *Engler* expressly states that there are *no* mounting holes on the plate, and that the two holes (20, 22), which are referred to in the Office Action, are for accommodating router bits, and not for mounting routers by their footprints. Furthermore, *Engler* states that the user must drill any mounting holes:

“Since different router constructions will have unique locations of mounting holes in the router base, the plate 10 may not be drilled to accommodate mounting screws for attaching the router R. Rather, the user will drill the necessary holes to accommodate his style of router, so as to mount it with [its] vertical output shaft coincident with the center of either hole 20, at position I, or hole 22, at position II.” (Col. 2, lines 38-45).

As such, it is improper to combine *Engler* with *Rice*, as *Engler* expressly teaches against providing a plate with at least two groups of hole patterns having different radial hole center distances, for mounting routers having different mounting footprints. Furthermore, even considering *Rice* and *Engler* in combination, neither teaches, suggests or even contemplates at least two groups of hole patterns having different radial hole center distances, for mounting routers having different mounting footprints as required by claims 6 and 11.

Accordingly, claims 6 and 11 are believed to be allowable over both *Rice* and *Engler*. Furthermore, claims 6 and 11 are believed to be allowable over all of the cited art, alone or in combination, for the above reasons. Additionally, claims 7, 12 and 14-27, which are dependent upon claims 6 and 11, are believed allowable for the above reasons.

In light of the foregoing comments, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Michael S. Leonard

Reg. No. 37,557

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4270

Dated: August 30, 2004

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes drawings for Figures 1-7. These sheets replace the original sheets including Figures 1-7.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets